

Study of $\pm J$ Ising Spin Glasses via Multicanonical Ensemble*

Tarik Celik^{1,2}, Ulrich H.E. Hansmann^{1,3} and Bernd Berg^{1,3,4}

Abstract

We performed numerical simulations of 2D and 3D Edwards-Anderson spin glass models by using the recently developed multicanonical ensemble. Our ergodicity times increase with the lattice size approximately as V^3 . The energy, entropy and other physical quantities are easily calculable at all temperatures from a single simulation. Their finite size scalings and the zero temperature limits are also explored.

The low temperature phase of the spin glasses has distinct properties like broken ergodicity and the absence of self-averaging, which in turn make their numerical investigation an extremely difficult task [1]. For temperatures below a bifurcation point, the spin glass configuration space is supposed to split off into a number of valleys which are separated by high energy barriers. Due to the exponentially increasing relaxation times [2] encountered in canonical simulations, tunneling between these many thermodynamics states becomes almost impossible. Recent simulations [3] of the 3D Edwards-Anderson model in a magnetic field seem to support the mean field picture [4] rather than the alternative droplet model [5], but it can be argued that equilibrium at sufficiently low temperatures has not been reached [6].

One of the simplest spin glass systems is described by the Edwards-Anderson Hamiltonian

$$H = - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} s_i s_j, \quad (1)$$

where the sum includes only the nearest neighbours and the exchange interactions $J_{ij} = \pm 1$ between the spins $s_i = \pm 1$ are the quenched random variables. The constraint $\sum J_{ij} = 0$ is imposed for each realization.

We present a new approach to spin glass simulations which reduces the exponential slowing to a power law and enables one to sample independent ground states in one simulation. This is achieved by exploiting the multicanonical ensemble [7].

¹*Supercomputer Computations Research Institute, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306, USA*

²*Department of Physics Engineering, Hacettepe University, 06532 Beytepe, Ankara, Turkey*

³*Department of Physics, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306, USA*

⁴*Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin, Wallotstr. 19, Berlin 33, Germany*

*To appear in the Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Workshop on Recent Developments in Computer Simulation Studies in Condensed Matter Physics, 22–26 Feb. 1993, Athens, Georgia.

The multicanonical ensemble can be defined by weight factors

$$P_M(E) = \exp[-\beta(E)E + \alpha(E)]. \quad (2)$$

$\alpha(E)$ and $\beta(E)$ are to be determined such that for the chosen energy range $E_{\min} \leq E \leq E_{\max}$ the resulting multicanonical probability density is approximately flat:

$$P_{mu}(E) = c_{mu} n(E)P_M(E) \approx \text{const} \quad (3)$$

where $n(E)$ is the spectral density. In the present study we take $E_{\max} = 0$ ($\beta(E) \equiv 0$ for $E \geq E_{\max}$) and $E_{\min} = E^0$ the ground state energy of the considered spin glass realization. The purpose of the function $\alpha(E)$ is to give $\beta(E)^{-1}$ the interpretation of an effective temperature. This leads to the recursion relation

$$\alpha(E - 4) = \alpha(E) + [\beta(E - 4) - \beta(E)] E \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha(E_{\max}) = 0$. The multicanonical function $\beta(E)$ is obtained via recursive multicanonical calculations. One performs simulations with $\beta^n(E)$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, which yield probability densities $P^n(E)$ with medians E_{median}^n . We start off with $n = 0$ and $\beta^0(E) \equiv 0$. The recursion from n to $n + 1$ reads

$$\beta^{n+1}(E) = \begin{cases} \beta^n(E) & \text{for } E \geq E_{median}^n; \\ \beta^n(E) + \\ \quad 0.25 \times \ln[P^n(E + 4)/P^n(E)] & \text{for } E_{median}^n > E \geq E_{\min}^n; \\ \beta^{n+1}(E_{\min}^n) & \text{for } E < E_{\min}^n. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The recursion is stopped for m with $E_{\min}^{m-1} = E^0$ being groundstate.

By weighting with $\exp[-\hat{\beta}E + \beta(E)E - \alpha(E)]$ canonical expectation values $\mathcal{O}(\hat{\beta}) = Z(\hat{\beta})^{-1} \sum_E \mathcal{O}(E)n(E) \exp(-\hat{\beta}E)$, where $Z(\hat{\beta}) = \sum_E n(E) \exp(-\hat{\beta}E)$ is the partition function, can be reconstructed for all $\hat{\beta}$ (the canonical inverse temperature). The normalization constant c_{mu} in equation (3) follows from $Z(0) = \sum_E n(E) = 2^N$, where N is the total number of spin variables. This gives the spectral density and allows to calculate the free energy as well as the entropy.

First, we simulated the 2D Ising model by setting all the exchange interactions to $J_{ij} = +1$ on a 50×50 lattice. Figure 1 stems from this simulation. Finite lattice energy density and specific heat results of Ferdinand and Fisher [8] were well reproduced. With $Z(0) = 2^{2500}$ used as input, we obtained 2.07 ± 0.22 for the number of groundstates. After having this check, we considered the Edwards-Anderson spin glass.

We performed multicanonical simulations of Edwards-Anderson spin glasses in 2D on L^2 lattices with $L = 4, 12, 24, 48$ and in 3D on L^3 lattices with $L = 4, 6, 8$ and 12 [9]. We investigated as many as 32 realizations (having different configurations of quenched random variables J_{ij}) for smallest lattices and 4 realizations for the largest. Following an initial 2×10^5 sweeps, the thermal averages were evaluated over 4×10^5 to 8×10^6 iterations depending on lattice size. 2 to 10 recursion steps of (5) were needed to reach to an approximately flat probability density (3).

Our ergodicity time τ_L^e is defined as the average number of sweeps needed to change the energy from $E_{\max}$ to $E_{\min}$ and back. In Figure 2 the ergodicity time for 2D is plotted

Figure 1: Ising model magnetic probability density.

versus lattice size L on a log-log scale. A straight line fit gives $\tau_L^e \sim L^{4.4(3)}$ sweeps, which in CPU time corresponds to a slowing down $\sim V^{3.2(2)}$. Here an exponential form yielded a completely unacceptable goodness of fit $Q < 10^{-6}$.

The infinite volume groundstate energy and entropy are estimated from FSS fits of the form $f_L^0 = f_\infty^0 + c/V$. For 2D these fits are depicted in Figure 3. Our groundstate energy density estimate $e^0 = -1.394 \pm 0.007$ and groundstate entropy per spin estimate $s^0 = 0.081 \pm 0.004$ are all consistent with previous MC [10] and the transfer matrix results [11]. The reported groundstate entropy value translates into a large number of distinct groundstates, for instance, implies 1.1×10^{81} groundstates on 48^2 lattice.

Figure 2: Ergodicity times versus lattice size.

For each realization we also evaluated spin glass susceptibility density $\chi_q = \langle q^2 \rangle / N$ and the Binder parameter $B_q = \frac{1}{2} [3 - \langle q^4 \rangle / \langle q^2 \rangle^2]$. Our results were consistent with the previous evaluations [1].

For 4^2 lattice we calculated the exact results by enumerating all 2^{16} configurations per realization and all quantities were found in agreement with the multicanonical evaluations.

Next we compared our performance with multicanonical simulation to that of canonical algorithm. For 12^2 and 24^2 lattices we performed an identical number of sweeps with multicanonical and canonical simulations for each realization. For all realizations the canonical tunneling rate is found smaller than the multicanonical one. When tunneling is

Figure 3: FSS estimate of the infinite volume groundstate energy and entropy per spin.

concerned, although it strongly depends on the realization, an estimated overall improvement factor 46 ± 22 for multicanonical simulations was observed for 12^2 lattices. For 24^2 lattices we obtained zero tunneling events for most of the realizations in canonical simulations and about 10 - 20 tunnelings for the multicanonical. In view of the ergodicity times we achieved, this is no surprise. It clearly shows the superiority of the multicanonical approach.

Dimension is a parameter in our codes. No difficulties were encountered in our investigation of 3D spin glasses and results were encouraging [9]. The groundstate energy density $e^0 = -1.786 \pm 0.003$ and entropy per spin $s^0 = 0.046 \pm 0.002$ are consistent with previous estimates [12]. For 3D we had a slowing down $\sim V^{3.4(2)}$.

For each realization we simulate two replica which differ only in the disordered starting configurations of spin variables s_i . Spin glass order parameter q can be defined as the overlap of the two replica [2]

$$q(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i^1 s_i^2. \quad (5)$$

To visualize the low temperature behaviour, we show in Figure 4 the spin glass order parameter distribution of one of the realizations on 8^3 lattice.

Figure 4: Spin glass order parameter distribution on 8^3 lattice.

Below the bifurcation temperature one clearly sees five configuration space valleys which are separated by high tunneling barriers. The multicanonical simulation overcomes these energy barriers by connecting back to the disordered high temperature states. The realization from which Figure 4 is depicted had nine tunnelings between the degenerate

groundstates. For the Ising ferromagnet of Figure 1, the number of tunneling events was 118.

Our results make clear that the multicanonical spin glass simulations are very feasible. Physical quantities can be evaluated at all temperatures from a single run. Tunneling through the high energy barriers and sampling of independent ground states become possible, which certainly are relevant enrichments for the simulation of spin glasses. An investigation of the total weight and the overlap pattern of the spin glass order parameter might yield invaluable information about their groundstate structure [13].

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by U.S. Department of Energy under contracts DE-FG05-87ER40319 and DE-FC05-85ER2500, Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft under contract H180411-1 and TUBITAK of Turkey. TC and UH acknowledge the warm hospitality at SCRI.

References

- [1] R.N. Bhatt and A.P. Young, Phys. Rev. B37 (1988) 5606; A.T. Ogielski, Phys. Rev. B32 (1985) 7384; A.J. Bray and M.A. Moore, Phys. Rev. B31 (1985) 631; W.J. McMillan, Phys. Rev. B30 (1984) 476; 31 (1985) 340; S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. B16 (1977) 4630.
- [2] K. Binder and A.P. Young, Rev. Mod. Phys. 58 (1986) 801; K.H. Fisher and J.A. Hertz, *Spin Glasses*, Cambridge Univ. Press 1991.
- [3] S. Caracciolo, G. Parisi, S. Patarnello and N. Sourlas, Europhysics Letters 11 (1990) 783; J. Phys. France 51 (1990) 1877.
- [4] G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43 (1979) 1754; J. Phys. A13 (1980) 1101.
- [5] D.A. Fisher and D.A. Huse, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56 (1986) 1601; Phys. Rev. B38 (1988) 386.
- [6] D.A. Fisher and D.A. Huse, J. de Physique I (1991) 621.
- [7] B. Berg and T. Neuhaus, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68 (1992) 9; Phys. Lett. B267 (1991) 249; G.M. Torrie and J.P. Valleu, J. Comput. Phys. 23 (1977) 187.
- [8] A. E. Ferdinand and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. 185 (1969) 832.
- [9] B. Berg and T. Celik, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 (1992) 2292 ; Int. J. Mod. Phys. C 3 (1992) 1251; B. Berg, T. Celik and U. Hansmann, to appear in Europhys. Lett.
- [10] R. H. Swendsen and J. S. Wang, Phys. Rev. B38 (1988) 4840.
- [11] H. F. Cheng and W. L. McMillan, J. Phys. C16 (1983) 7027.
- [12] I. Morgenstern and K. Binder, Z. Physik B39 (1980) 227; S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. B16 (1977) 4630.
- [13] B. Berg, T. Celik and U. Hansmann, in preparation.